

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. No claims have been added, cancelled, withdrawn, or amended. Thus, claims 1, 3-39, 41-77, 79-82 are presented for reconsideration.

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-39, 41-77, and 79-81 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,341,316 to Kloba et al. Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1, 3-39, 41-77, and 79-81 is not anticipated by Kloba.

Kloba discloses enabling web content and other objects to be loaded on mobile devices, such that users of mobile devices can operate with the web content on their mobile devices in an interactive manner while in an off-line mode. Kloba discloses capturing content and storing it on a client to subsequently allow the user to view the content on the device offline. (Kloba, col. 13, lines 65-67). For certain data, which is periodically updated, instead of sending all of the data, Kloba compares the newly downloaded data with data already in the client device's cache, and only the changes are transmitted to the device. (Kloba, col. 14, line 64 to col. 15, line 2).

The Examiner seems to confuse the client cache of Kloba with a server cache, which is recited in the present invention's claims. The portion of Kloba pointed to by the Examiner (column 17, lines 49-52) specifically state that "the page is obtained from the cache of the client 108, or if not in the cache then from server 104." This very clearly refers to a client cache, which is not equivalent to a server cache.

Furthermore, the Examiner points to the web synchronization module which translates/transforms/optimizes the object for use by a particular client. (column 23, lines 60-67). Applicants note that the web synchronization module does not store these

optimized objects in a server cache, but rather forwards them directly to the client. In fact, Kloba makes clear that what is stored on the server is only the hash of the data, in order to determine whether data has changed over time. In contrast, the present invention stores copies of media objects in determined formats. Thus, instead of storing a hash, as in Kloba, claim 1 recites storing the copy having said determined format in a server cache.

Claim 1 recites:

In an online system, a method for determining the capabilities of client devices and supplying media content in a format suitable for such devices, the method comprising:

receiving a request to provide a target device with a copy of a particular media object;
determining capabilities of the target device;
based on the capabilities of the target device, determining a format that is desired for providing the target device with a copy of the media object;
translating the particular media object into a copy having said determined format;
providing the target device with the copy having said determined format; and
storing the copy having said determined format in a server cache.

(Emphasis Added). As noted above, Kloba does not teach or suggest a server cache, and thus Kloba does not teach or suggest storing the transformed objects in the server cache. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Kloba.

Claim 39 recites:

An online system for providing digital media to target devices, the system comprising:
a capabilities module for determining the capabilities of a particular target device;
a transformation module for:
automatically retrieving a copy of a particular digital media object;

providing the target device with a copy of said object, said copy being automatically translated into a particular format based on the capabilities of the target device; and
storing the copy of said translated object in a server cache.

(Emphasis Added). As discussed above, Kloba does not teach or suggest storing the copy of the translated object in a server cache. Accordingly, independent claim 39 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Kloba.

Claim 77 recites:

In an online system, a method for determining the capabilities of client devices, the method comprising:
receiving an original request from a target device in which said target device does not include information regarding its capabilities;
determining capabilities of the target device by examining the request submitted by the device;
supplementing said original request received from said target device with information about the capabilities of said target device; and
forwarding said supplemented request to a destination specified in said original request.

(Emphasis added). Kloba discusses a client sending updated information including a request in box 306 and the server interacting with the client to determine the state of the client's resources. (Also, see Kloba, col. 21, lines 3-18). The Examiner notes that "Therefore the client's request and the server performs the hash operation based on the client's request object are satisfying the limitations of the information is obtained from examining the request submitted by the client (device)." However, in Kloba the request object supplies the client-cached content for comparison. Thus, while information is obtained by examining the request, that information does not include determining capabilities of the target device, by examining the request, as recited in claim 77. Thus, Kloba discloses determining capabilities of the target device by interacting with the device, not by examining the request submitted by the device.

Applicant notes that the Examiner, in the recitation of claim elements states that Kloba discloses the step of "determining capabilities of the target device." Applicant further notes that the actual claim, of claim 77, recites determining capabilities of the target device by examining the request. The determination based on an examination of the request is neither taught nor suggested by Kloba. Rather, as Kloba describes at col. 21, lines 3-18, the determination of the client's status is made based on "state information regarding the nature of the client's resources" which is obtained by the server. Thus, Kloba does not determine client capabilities of the target device by examining the request submitted by the device.

Accordingly, independent claim 77 and its dependent claims 78-82 are not anticipated by Kloba.

Examiner rejected claims 20, 22-23, 25-27, 63, 65, and 67-68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0041110 to Wenocur et al. Applicants do not admit that Wenocur is properly prior art to the present invention.

However, Kloba and Wenocur in combination do not make these claims obvious. Claims 20, 22-23, 25-27 depend on claim 1, while claims 63, 65, and 67-68 depend on claim 39, directly or indirectly.

As noted above, with respect to claim 1, Kloba does not teach or suggest using a server cache to store translated objects. Wenocur's system is designed for providing authentication, integrity, confidentiality, non-repudiation, replay protection, and other security properties. Wenocur does not discuss translating objects into a different form. Therefore, clearly, Wenocur does not teach or suggest using a server cache to store

translated objects. Thus, the claims are not obvious over the combination of Kloba and Wenocur.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Judith Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 31, 2006

/Judith Szepesi/

Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No. 39,393

Customer No. 08791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300